DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 123 EA 023 507

AUTHOR Gmelch, Walter H.
TITLE The Creation of Constructive Conflict within Educational Administration Departments.
PUB DATE Oct 91
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (Baltimore, MD, October 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Change Strategies; *College Faculty; *Conflict Resolution; *Department Heads; *Educational Administration; Higher Education; Instructional Leadership; Intergroup Relations; *Problem Solving

ABSTRACT

Issues in the resolution of departmental conflict by university chairs of educational administration departments are discussed in this paper. The need for finding more constructive ways to handle conflict is highlighted by a survey of 808 department chairs at 101 research and doctoral-granting universities, in which chairs identified intercollegial conflict as the major category of stress. The view of principled conflict management that recognizes conflict as necessary is advocated, 10 structural relationships that contribute to conflict are identified, and an analytical framework for developing a reform agenda is presented. The role of the chair as mediator is also discussed. The recommendation is made that reform be developed in a climate of constructive conflict. Five tables are included. (25 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED339123

The Creation of Constructive Conflict Within Educational Administration Departments

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. H. Gmelch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Walter H. Gmelch
Department of Educational Administration
Washington State University
Pullman, WA 99164-2136
(509) 335-9117

Paper Presented at University Council for Educational Administration Convention. Baltimore, Maryland, October, 1991

EA 023 507

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Creation of Constructive Conflict Within Educational Administration Departments

Introduction

The 1990's promise to be a decade of major change for the 3,100 universities and colleges in the United States. Changing student clientele, disintegrating college curriculum, growing technological changes, and shifting attitudes and practices of faculty represent the forces currently shaping higher education (Keller, 1983). This transformation is especially important for the hundreds of educational administration department chairs responsible for adapting, developing and leading their programs into the current decade of reflection and reform. Progress, change and reform cannot be made without conflict and nothing is as important for educational administration departments than the emergence of department chairs equipped to handle conflict created by these challenges.

The popularity and urgency of the educational reform movement places department chairs in a difficult position. One of the major impediments to reform is conflicting faculty values and interests. In order to foresee and respond effectively to pressures for reform, chairs need to be equipped with constructive conflict management skills. Since most chairs have not received management training, this paper focuses on the issues necessary for educational administration chairs to recognize and resolve conflicts within their departments.

Background

In the Spring of 1990 the UCEA Center for the Study of the Department Chair conducted a survey of department chairs in 101 research and doctoral

granting colleges and universities across the United States which included 51 UCEA institutions and 50 non-UCEA. Eight department chairs were selected from each institution, stratified by eight discipline classifications of hard vs. soft, applied vs. pure, and life vs. nonlife, resulting in a sample of 808 chairs. All UCEA educational administration department chairs were selected as well as a match sample of non-UCEA educational administration chairs (Gmelch & Carroll, 1991).

This study was undertaken to expand the theoretical and practical understanding of department chairs, specifically regarding the stresses and conflicts associated with chairing academic departments. Not surprisingly, chairs identified conflict with colleagues as the major category of stress. As noted in Table 1, over 40 percent of the department chairs suffered excessive stress from "making decision affecting others, resolving collegial differences and evaluating faculty performance" (Gmelch and Burns, 1991). In contrast, only 17 percent of the chairs complained of excessive stress from resolving differences with deans, and 5 percent with students. Thus, chairs suffered from more interpersonal conflict with their colleagues than with their deans or students. Overall, no other chair activities produced as much stress as these faculty-based responsibilities.

Conflict and Department Chair Dissatisfaction

In this study, chairs also described when they felt most dissatisfied with their jobs. Second only to bureaucratic red tape and paperwork was the chairs' frustration with interpersonal conflict. Sixty percent of their dissatisfaction came from dealing with their colleagues which emanated from the following sources of faculty conflict.

1. **Inter-faculty Conflict.** Most of the chairs' dissatisfaction came from faculty disagreeing amongst each other which resulted in "bickering, whining, and feuding", "acting without reason", or "ideological and personal wars."

2. **Faculty Attitude.** Chairs felt disappointed when faculty were seen as "unimaginative, apathetic, disengaged" colleagues, who "are recalcitrant and no longer focus on the mission" and "do not measure up to their potential."

3. **Unsupportive Faculty.** Another source of conflict for chairs surfaced when faculty did not support the direction of the department, e.g. "chairs dealing with faculty resistance to improvements and change", "faculty acting unreasonably (and selfishly) thereby causing turmoil and compromising the achievement of departmental objectives", and "when interpersonal differences between faculty inhibit the mission of the department and . . . basically work against the good of the department."

4. **Unsupportive Chair.** Chairs also expressed remorse when they could not support their faculty and had "to make decisions which cause great disappoint to my colleagues", and "when I can't, or don't have the resources to reward good faculty".

5. **Role of Evaluation.** Although evaluation is inherent in their role, chairs reported difficulty in having to "evaluate their colleagues", "conduct annual reviews", "make tough decision on merit evaluations and salaries", and "fire faculty".

6. **Role of Mediation.** Finally, the chairs' role in mediating conflict between their colleagues caused them to be dissatisfied. Generally, one chair expressed concern over "severe faculty confrontations" and another expressed difficulty "when I have to referee bad interpersonal relations between faculty."

The other 40% of conflict situations causing chair dissatisfaction stemmed from dealing with higher level administration. Chairs commented about the "frustration from **lack of support**" or "**unresponsiveness** from higher administration", and "when higher-up administrators do **not share information** upon which decisions affecting my department are made." Another concern came from chairs' frustration when "higher administration requires what seems to be **excessive paperwork**" or "**unrealistic deadlines**" and "requesting reports that are never responded to." Finally, chairs felt conflict with higher level administrators when they had **opposing values**, felt **unappreciated** for the work that has been done or successes accomplished, and when their recommendations or **input** was **not accepted**.

The chairs' lament over conflict and dissatisfaction with their interpersonal interactions draws attention to the need to handle conflict in more constructive and satisfying ways in order for departments to face the challenge of educational reform.

Approaches to Conflict Management

When one thinks of conflict what is the first word that comes to mind? Most develop images of controversy, disagreement, or differing opinions between faculty members. While negative images of conflict may predominate, is controversy necessarily undesirable? Emotional responses to conflict may be positive (excitement, enjoyment, stimulation, curiosity, creativity, commitment, involvement), negative (anger, distrust, resentment, fear, rejection), or even neutral (change or a different point of view).

No matter what the answer or reaction, one of management's main functions is to adjudicate conflicting demands (Katz and Kahn, 1978). How should department chairs view conflict within their departments? The answer rests in their basic philosophical approach. As Table 2 portrays, three

philosophies reflect managerial attitudes toward conflict: traditional, behavioral, and principled. The first two philosophies espouse views historically held in the management literature (Robbins, 1974).

Traditional

The traditionalists' approach from the late nineteenth century through the middle 1940's was simple: Conflict is destructive and therefore should be eliminated. The role of the manager was to purge conflict from the organization. In higher education, the traditionalist chair believed that conflict should be thoroughly analyzed, suppressed, and eliminated -- it was destructive and should be avoided (Williams, 1985). Naturally, exceptions to this generalization existed, but the bottom line seemed to be that conflict created ill dispositions rather than constructive dialogue.

Behavioral

By the 1950's the behavioral view gained popularity in the literature and in practice. Freud believed that aggressiveness was an innate, independent, instinctual disposition of people. Therefore, chairs should accept conflict as natural and inevitable, since "complex organizations, by their very nature, have built-in conflicts. Disagreements over goals clearly exist. Sections compete for recognition. Departments compete for prestige. . . All compete for power" (Robbins, 1974, p. 13). As management guru, Warren Bennis points out: "Conflicts stem basically from differences among persons and groups. Elimination of conflict would mean the elimination of such differences. The goal of conflict management is, for us, better conceived as the acceptance and enhancement of differences among persons and groups. . . " (Bennis, Benne, and Chin, 1969, p. 152). The department chair strategy, therefore, would be to

manage conflict since it is inevitable. However, just managing conflict because it is inevitabile does not go far enough. In order to tap the real benefit of conflict, it should, at times, be promoted to explore needed reform based on common grounds, interests and mutual benefits -- thus, leading to the third stage of conflict management, principled.

Principled

By the 1980's management of conflict entered into what has been termed a principled approach. Principled conflict management promotes integrity and high standards in the resolution of disputes such that both parties exhibit righteous, upright and trustworthy principles in attempting to satisfy both parties' differences. The use of "tricky tactics" gave way to a more honest, open, principled approach. In essence, the principled approach views conflict as a necessary and encouraged condition of administration. While in the 1970's a review of managerial practices found few administrators employing principled philosophy (Robbins, 1974), over the past decade more successful administrators have begun to recognize that in many instances conflict can be a sign of a healthy academic organization. In addition, the recent popularity of the Harvard Negotiation Project has influenced a broader based use of principled conflict resolution as espoused by Roger Fisher and William Ury (1983).

The following sections address principled conflict management with these objectives in mind: (1). **Recognize** the nature and causes of conflict; and (2). **Resolve** conflict through the principled approach in order to achieve mutually acceptable educational reform.

Conflict Resolution

The first step a chair must take toward a positive and constructive conflict style is to recognize the nature and causes of conflict in the department and the university or college. Unfortunately most people take conflict personally and believe that if they are involved in controversy it must be due to their personality. As Allen Tucker (1984) points out, many chairs feel that for some reason conflict is their fault. However, even though chairs may not like to talk about conflict, they need to accept the idea that it occurs and will be inevitable if change is to take place in educational administration.

A review of the research on organizational conflict reveals 10 structural relationships which actually can create conflict and barriers to educational reform. It is important for educational administration chairs striving to renew their programs to recognize these role and organizational barriers. They must understand that such barriers are built into the structure of institutions of higher education. As chairs, they need to realize that regardless of the causes, it is their responsibility to confront these barriers in order to facilitate effective reform.

1. **Levels**. Most would agree that as the size of an organization increases, goals become less clear, interpersonal relationships become more formal, departments become more specialized and the potential for conflict intensifies. These assumptions have been supported by research in educational organizations. Specifically, Corwin (1969) found that 83 percent of the schools with six or seven levels of authority reported high rates of disagreement between faculty and administrators as contrasted to 14 percent in schools with three or fewer levels of authority. As one would expect, as the administrative line-authority in universities increases, the potential for conflict between the echelons also increases. Thus, chairs must strive to flatten the hierarchy in order to promote and implement the changes needed for reform.

2. **Rules and Regulations.** Generally, as job structure increases the amount of role certainty increases, thus reducing *inter*personal conflict between employees. However, with greater job structure, employees also feel greater *intra*personal role conflict since they become confined by routinization, rules and regulations. In higher education, where faculty have a great deal of autonomy, the potential for interpersonal conflict increases since roles and expectations become less clear and more difficult to monitor and supervise. On the flip side, this autonomy also reduces their potential intrapersonal conflict. The key is to capture the energy from autonomy and synergistically transform it into productive ideas for educational reform.

3. **Degree of Specialization.** In a study of schools, high degrees of specialization increased the intensity of conflict. Therefore, secondary schools segmented into departments suffer more conflict than homogeneous elementary schools. Higher education institutions, with departments housed in separate buildings, experience more conflict than secondary schools. This, of course, does not presuppose that elementary schools represent a more positive working environment than colleges: conflict can also cause positive outcomes. Nevertheless, chairs need to use the creative conflict from specializations to enrich the discussion of the reform agenda.

4. **Staff Composition.** Established groups have been found to develop more constructive conflict than ad hoc committees (Hall and Williams, 1966). Therefore one would expect high staff turnover to stimulate conflict within organizations (Robbins, 1974). Given that faculty tend to be less mobile in higher education than other professions, their stability may be a factor in reduced departmental conflicts. While a homogeneous staff may experience less interpersonal conflict than a heterogeneous group, the conflict generated in the mixed group may result in more productive and healthy changes.

5. **Nature of Supervision.** The closer one is supervised the more conflict will be created. While this may be true, what is the desired outcome of the close supervision? If change is required in employee behavior then close supervision may be necessary to affect positive results. Faculty in higher education plan and control their own work and work style, and as long as they produce the desired results in teaching, research and service, close supervision may create unnecessary tension. However, how does a chair shake up an entrenched faculty resistant to exploring new ways of preparing educational administrators?

6. **Participation in Decision Making.** Faculty assume they will and should be involved in departmental decision making. Interestingly, as the level of participation increases, the amount of conflict also increases. This is especially true where value differences exist and when educational administration departments attempt to change 'sacred' programs. The assumption behind participatory decision making, however, is that the quality of the decisions will increase with more input. While this may be true in most cases, there are definitely tradeoffs among efficiency, effectiveness and program implementation.

7. **Sources of Power.** French and Raven (1968) suggest five bases of social power (1968). In essence, department chairs can influence the reform movement through several sources: through the authority vested in the position (legitimate power); through their ability to provide rewards and recognition (reward power) or punishment and withholding rewards (coercive power); through their knowledge and skills (expertise power); and/or through their ability of personal persuasion (referent power). Summaries of research indicate that the use of expertise and referent power (personal sources) yields greater satisfaction and performance of the staff than coercive power (Yukl, 1981). Normative organizations such as universities and colleges rely predominantly on symbols

rather than coercion or financial reward to influence employees. Leaders in these organizations, department chairs in particular, use formal control by virtue of both their personality and position to motivate and coordinate their colleagues (Etzioni, 1964). In fact, "low and moderate levels of power . . . can assist in improving coordination and, therefore, work to reduce conflict. But where power is excessive, as perceived by a less powerful group, one may expect it to be challenged, causing increased conflict" (Robbins, 1974, p. 48). Additionally, faculty hold exceptional power due to their professionalism: their expertise can critically contribute to the success or failure of reform.

8. **Rewards and Recognition.** Rewards and recognition also contribute significantly to conflict. When a differential reward structure is used for two or more groups or departments, conflict is likely to occur. This is even more prevalent if the groups perceive they are competing for the same or limited resources. If a fixed sum of merit increases must be divided among faculty, chairs will likely encounter conflict between and among colleagues. In other words, the more rewards emphasize separate performance rather than combined performance, the greater the conflict (Walton and Dutton, 1969). Faculty, who mostly teach in isolation and solitarily publish manuscripts, find themselves in competition for and in conflict over the limited resources for reward and recognition. Therefore, the faculty as a collective must buy into the reform package and equally reap its benefits.

9. **Interdependence.** In much the same way that differentiated reward and recognition create conflict, a limited amount of resources to be shared among colleagues sets the stage for increased conflict. When one faculty member's gain is another's loss, faculty believe that the allocation of resources is a "zero-sum" game, and the department is destined for conflict. Also if faculty must rely on each other, or one department rely on another department, or one academic

course builds on another, conflict may result. In his definitive work on conflict, sociologist Georg Simmel (1955) concludes that conflict will occur when the activities of one group have a direct consequence on the other group's ability to achieve its goal. Therefore, departmental reform will necessitate faculty interdependence and result in some tension between faculty as they become dependent on each other to achieve the desired results.

10. **Roles and Responsibilities.** Managers, who perform liaison or linkage roles in organizations, often find themselves in role conflict situations (Kahn et al., 1964). Academic department chairs encounter even greater role conflict since they are in a somewhat unique position without common management parallels. Researchers have found that department chairs are plagued with inherent structural conflict since they must act as the conduit of information and policy between the administration and the faculty of the institution (Lee, 1985; Milstein, 1987). Ambiguity and role conflict results from attempting to bridge the administrative and academic cores of the university, which are organized and operated differently (Bare, 1986). The academic core of teaching and research operates freely and independently in a loosely-coupled system, whereas the managerial core maintains the mechanistic qualities of a tightly-coupled system. The department chair is at the heart of the tension between the two systems. While this dynamic conflict between administration and academics is critical in order to maintain higher education organizations, it does place the department chair in a difficult position to mediate between the demands of administration and faculty. They feel trapped between the pressure to perform as a faculty member and as an administrator. These pressures unique to departmental chairs result in a paradoxical dilemma much like the Greek god, *Janus*, who had two faces. Chairs are seen with both faculty member and administrator faces. This posture leads to split loyalties and mixed

commitment on the part of chairs to continue with reform efforts in the shadow of conflict.

In summary, a review of the research of educational institutions reveals 10 work relationships which inevitably increase the intensity of conflict among colleagues. It is not difficult to infer that higher education institutions are potentially plagued with conflict due to their many levels, rules and regulations, specialized disciplines, heterogeneous staffing, participatory decision-making, segmented rewards, high interdependence, use of authoritative positional power, and the Janus positions of department chairs.

The purpose of recognizing the nature of conflict in this section is not to debate whether the conflict from these organizational characteristics is negative or positive, but to recognize the influence it has in shaping the acceptance or rejection of reform.

Conflict Resolution

In order to structure constructive debate regarding educational reform, chairs must strive to satisfy faculty interests and concerns in the name of reform. Several questions can provide a framework for analyzing how to bargain and develop the reform agenda (Raiffa, 1982).

1. Are there more than two points of view? Visualize two faculty members sitting across the table from one another discussing the possible merger of their two courses in order to develop a new and innovative course needed for the reform program. The question here is whether both of them represent all the interests and concerns which should be considered, or are other constituencies and interested parties lined up behind each of them, essentially forming a 'vertical' team. While both may agree on the terms of a merger, they may have forgotten to consult their vertical teams: other faculty, staff, students, and most

importantly practicing administrators. Before entering an agreement, each of the parties must consider the vertical team behind them.

2. Are the faculty teams monolithic? Rather than an exception, it is probably the rule that each side of a proposal is not internally monolithic. This question concerns faculty "horizontal" teams; faculty sitting side by side on the same side of the issue or proposal. Are both faculty members monolithic in their interests? Probably not. Take the classic case of the defending attorney and client. Both want resolution to the problem, but the client's interest may be to resolve the case immediately to take care of bills, relieve time pressures and other interests. However, the attorney, who may be paid by clock hours or a percentage of the settlement, may want to hold out for a larger portion of the settlement.

3. Are there linkage effects? One agreement may have an effect on another. If a chair agrees to release one faculty member to prepare a proposal, the same principles should be used for the next request. The chair's decisions, therefore, should be based on sound and defensible principles.

4. Is there more than one issue? Multiple issue problems require trade-offs and often present difficult analytical challenges. If multiple issues exist, develop a hierarchy from which faculty can analyze each issue against another, and make their trade-offs.

5. Is ratification among faculty required? Several methods of decision making can be used, from leader-centered to group-centered. If conflict is likely among the alternative proposals, the final decision should be taken to faculty for ratification or endorsement.

6. Are threats possible? While physical threats are highly unlikely, tenured faculty have a great deal of power and can make reform difficult if they

do not concur. Chairs need to consider the possible threats that may surface from unilateral decisions.

7. Are negotiations public or private? What faculty state in an open faculty meeting may have significantly more impact than what they might negotiate one-on-one behind closed doors. Statements made in public forums that later are retracted may cause a loss of face and reputation.

8. Is there a time constraint or time-related cost? Clearly the closer one is to a deadline, such as the beginning of an academic year, the more powerful is the need to come to closure. For example, when the North Vietnamese came to Paris to seek a settlement to the Vietnam War, they rented a house on a two-year lease, and let that fact be known. The party who has to negotiate in haste is disadvantaged.

Answers to these questions can help departments organize their thoughts and search for wise solutions to the reform question. Overall, chairs must be cautious that the *relationship* between faculty should not be indiscriminately sacrificed to the benefit of *reform*. Fisher and Ury (1983) of the Harvard Negotiation Project discovered methods to confirm and expand this assumption. They believe any method of resolution may be fairly judged by three criteria: (1) It should produce wise agreement (outcome); (2) It should improve or at least not damage the relationship between the people involved; and (3) It should be efficient. The first and second criteria reiterate the importance of *relationships and reform*. The third criteria suggests a measure of expediency and effectiveness.

Substance or wise outcome is that which "meets the legitimate interests of each side to the extent possible, resolves conflicting interests fairly, is durable, and takes community interests into account" (Fisher and Ury, 1983, p. 4). The most common form of resolution is achieved through a process of positioning and

repositioning which may or may not take into consideration the true interests of both parties. While it does serve the purpose of telling the other side what is wanted and where one stands, positioning fails to meet the basic criteria. In fact, arguing over positions produces unwise agreements, is inefficient, and endangers ongoing relationships.

In contrast to **positional** resolution, the technique of **principled** resolution as espoused by Fisher and Ury provides a straightforward method of conflict resolution appropriate for use in almost any circumstance, especially in academic settings where both outcome and relationships are very important to achieve and maintain. Four points provide the cornerstones for the foundation of principled resolution.

1. Interests: Focus on interests, not positions. Focusing on positions will produce win, lose or yield results, all of which do not guarantee that both parties have achieved a satisfying, long-term resolution. As outlined in Table 3, interests are the basic needs of a party such as values, principles or psychological and physiological needs. Needs are rarely talked about when parties come into conflict situations, and are also very difficult to clarify because they are usually intangible, rarely negotiable, and not measurable. Some of the needs expressed by faculty are such things as security, economic well-being, social acceptance, power, recognition, control, and autonomy. The bottom line is that interest satisfaction must be achieved if conflict is to be resolved.

2. People: Separate people from the problem. In the days of demonstrations and civil disobedience duing the 1950's and 1960's the book by Saul Alinsky, *Rules for Radicals* (1971) taught: attack the person psychologically and once the ego gets involved, the adversary has the advantage. Principled resolution avoids personal attacks and does not impute personal feelings or concerns to others. The parties look for perceptions by actively listening and

empathizing with other's needs. When department chairs become committed to a position, their egos become connected to their position and their energies may direct them toward their own defense, leading to attack of their adversaries rather than solution of the problem. In contrast, focusing on the problem allows the interests and perceptions of both parties to be explored without personal attacks which destroy relationships.

3. Options: Generate a variety of possibilities before deciding what to do. Avoid premature judgments or locking in on positions before assumptions are examined and interests are explored. Once faculty lock into positions, they represent a line of arguments from position A to position B with options defined along the line between these two points. The only resolution possible after positioning is compromising between A and B such that one party loses and the other wins. In fact, a solution (point C) may exist, not even on the A-B line, which creatively satisfies both parties' needs. Creativity aids in the search for mutually beneficial solutions.

4. Criteria: Base resolution on objective standards. Department chairs and faculty must find fair standards and procedures to achieve the desired end results. It is more likely a wise and fair resolution will be produced if standards of fairness, efficiency, and merit are brought into the discussion. In position resolution, parties spend their time and energy defending their position and attacking the other side. An agreement consistent with such standards as client need, equal treatment, market value, moral codes or professional ethics is less vulnerable to attack. In the search for resolution both faculty and administration must yield to principle, not to pressure.

To summarize, the principled method, in contrast to positional resolution focuses on basic interests of all parties involved such that they search for mutually satisfying options and fair standards and procedures (see Table 4).

Traditionally the positional resolution of conflict has taken sides, either through **hard** or **soft** negotiations. The soft position emphasizes the importance of building and maintaining relationships such that they approach conflict as friends, seeking agreement, making offers, and yielding to pressure. In contrast, the hard position sees faculty as adversaries who seek victory, make threats, and apply pressures.

Faculty do not have to choose between hard or soft styles of resolution. The above four principles enable them to change the rules of the game and approach reform and conflict from a principled point of view so they see each other as mutual problem solvers, seeking a wise outcome by exploring interests and yielding to principle, not pressure. Table 5 displays the contrasting highlights of these three conflict resolution approaches.

The Department Chair As Mediator

The preceeding discussion on resolution may lead chairs to believe that their primary role in conflict resolution is to negotiate an equitable settlement, protecting the interests of all parties at the same time. This assumes that chairs, personally, are in conflict with faculty over reform. However, chairs should recognize their important role in assisting with the resolution of conflict *between* faculty as well. In addition to developing negotiation skills, chairs should also understand the roles and skills required to mediate faculty conflict.

While the role of negotiator often is intuitively understood, the mediation process requires different functions and skills. Chairs as mediators need to perform the roles of conflict assessor, process convener, resource expander, reality tester, and active listener. As mediator, it is critical for the chair to be objective, neutral, and non-aligned with either side. However, this neutrality role does pose some problems when faculty have disproportionate power bases and

abilities to articulate their cases. The chair must assume a role in encouraging the less vocal faculty to speak up and express needs, for the minority opinion today may be the majority tomorrow.

Ingredients for Satisfying Resolution

Regardless of the approach chairs use to resolve conflict in their departments, whether it be mediation or negotiation, the key is in its durability; will it stand up over time? The long-term solution comes from each party's sense of satisfaction in three areas: procedural satisfaction, substantive satisfaction and psychological satisfaction (Lincoln & O'Donnell, 1986). If faculty have a high degree of dissatisfaction in any of these three areas, there is great likelihood that the reform agreement developed may be short lived and result in conflict aftermath. In order to avoid conflict aftermath chairs must make sure that all three levels of satisfaction are reached.

Procedural Satisfaction. The basic question for procedural satisfaction is whether faculty were satisfied with the reform proceedings; before, during and after. Who initiated the process? Where did the meetings take place? Who was involved? Faculty must feel they had control over the process and were not forced into any unusual, uncomfortable or disadvantageous situations. The ultimate test of procedural satisfaction is whether faculty would use the same process again.

Substantive Satisfaction. Faculty must feel a sense of adequate resolution. This can only happen if a reasonable level of interest satisfaction is achieved. The key to substantive satisfaction is not in the development of the ultimate reform package, but in an acceptable level of satisfaction for all faculty.

Psychological Satisfaction. A balance between faculty relationships and reform must be achieved if faculty are to be psychologically satisfied. If the department feels better after developing the reform proposals than before,

psychological satisfaction has most likely occurred. Rather than feeling like a winner or loser, each faculty member should have a sense of equity in the resolution and ownership in the solution. Psychological blackmail is less likely to occur and compliance with the solution will be achieved.

Conclusion

In conclusion, there is probably little in this paper which department chairs do not already know, intuitively. The purpose is to expose chairs to the issues surrounding conflict in order to help educational administration departments become aware of the natural conflict barriers to reform, and to organize their conflict resolution approach into a more creative, and constructive framework.

This is not a paper on how to win in battle against faculty, but how to deal with differences such that both parties join forces in search for reform, and at the same time enjoy mutual respect and a positive and productive working relationship. The ideas presented here should help departments learn about developing reform in a climate of constructive conflict. The next step is yours. As a wise old Chinese philosopher once said: *To know, and not to use, is not yet to know.* Use it so you may now know it.

References

Alinsky, S. D. (1971). *Rules for radicals: A practical primer for realistic radicals*. New York: Random House.

Bare, A. (1986). Managerial behavior of college chairpersons and administrators. *Research in Higher Education, 24*(2), pp. 128-138.

Bennis, W. G., Benne, K. D., & Chen, R. (1969). *The planning of change* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston.

Corwin, R. G. (1969). Patterns of organizational conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, December, pp. 507-520.

Etzioni, A. (1964). *A comparitive analysis of complex organizations: On power, involvement, and then correlates*. New York: Free Press.

Fisher, R., & Ury, W. (1983). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. Ontario, Canada: Penguin Books.

French, J. R. P. Jr., & Raven, B. (1986). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright, & A. Zander (Eds.), *Group dynamics: Research and theory* New York: Harper and Row.

Gmelch, W. H., & Burns, J. S. (1991). *Sources of stress for academic department chairs: A national perspective*. Paper presented at the

American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois. April 3-7, 1991.

Gmelch, W. H., & Carroll, J. B. (1991). *The three rs of conflict management for department chairs and faculty.* Paper presented at the Third National Conference on Personal and Professional Renewal for Faculty, Atlanta, Georgia. April 18-20, 1991.

Hall, J., & Williams, M. S. (1966). A comparison of decision-making performances in established and ad hoc groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* February, pp. 214-222.

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity* . New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *Social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Keller, G. (1983). *Academic strategy: The management revolution in higher education* . Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lee, D. E. (1985). Department chairpersons' perceptions of the role in three institutions. *Perception and Motor Skills, 61*, pp. 23-49.

Lincoln, W. & O'Donnell, R. (1986). *The course for mediators and impartial hearing officers.* Tacoma, WA: National Center Associates.

Milstein, M. (1987). *Dilemmas in the chairpersons' role and what can be done about them.* . Pullman, Washington: Center for the Study of the Department Chair, Washington State University.

Moses, I. & Roe, E. (1990). *Heads and chairs: Managing academic departments.* Queensland, Australia: University of Queensland Press.

Raiffa, H. (1982). *The art and science of negotiation.* Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Robbins, S. P. (1974). *Managing organizational conflict* . Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Savage, G. T., Blair, J. D., & Sorenson, R. L. (1989). Consider both relationship and substance when negotiating strategically. *The Academic Management Executive, 3*(1), pp. 37-48.

Simmel, G. (1955). *Conflict* . New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Tucker, A. (1984). *Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Walton, R. E., & Dutton, J. M. (1969). The management of interpersonal conflict: A model and review. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* (March), pp. 73-84.

Williams, M. J. Jr. (1985). The management of conflict. In R. J. Fecher (Ed.), *Applying corporate management strategies. New dimensions for higher education, no. 50* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Yukl, G. A. (1981). *Leadership in organizations* . Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Table 1

Chair Confrontational Stressors

Making Decisions Affecting Others	**45%**
Resolving Collegial Differences	**45%**
Evaluating Faculty Performance	**42%**
Resolving Differences with Superiors	**17%**
Resolving Differences with Students	**5%**

27

Table 2

Approaches to Organizational Conflict

Period	Philosophy	Nature	Prescription Strategy
1890-1940's	**Traditional**	Destructive	Eliminate
1950-1980's	**Behavioral**	Natural	Accept
Present Time	**Principled**	Necessary	Encourage

Table 3

Exploring Interests

Definition

The basic intangible or abstract needs of a party such as values, principles, or needs

Characteristics

Rarely negotiable
Usually intangible
Not measurable
May be substituted for other interests

Results

Interest satisfaction must be achieved if conflict is to be resolved

Table 4
Principled Conflict Resolution Skills

I. Don't bargain over position since it often:
- endangers ongoing relationships.
- becomes difficult when more than two parties are involved.
- places all parties in a win/lose situation.

II. Separate the people from the problem
- Recognize the individual
- Look for perceptions (actively listen, empathize)
- Don't impute your feelings or concerns to others
- Avoid personal attacks

III. Focus on interests
- Behind each position lies both differing and compatible interests
- Identify interests (explore the why's and why not's)
- Look forward -- not back
- Be hard on the problem, be soft on the people

IV. Invent Options
- Avoid premature judgments, examine your assumptions
- Be creative
- Look for mutual benefit (not win/lose)
- Find additional resources, remove obstacles

V. Use Objective Criteria
- Find fair standards, fair procedures
- Establish common purpose, desired end results
- Yield to principle -- not to pressure

Table 5

Ways to Resolve Conflict

SOFT	HARD	PRINCIPLED
Friends	Adversaries	Problem Solver
Agreement	Victory	Wise Outcome
Trust	Distrust	Independent of Trust
Make Offers	Make Threats	Explore Interests
Yield to Pressure	Apply Pressure	Yield to Principle, Not Pressure